

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE       | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/524,612  | 03/14/2000        | Scott Graham         | 30096.00001             | 8732             |
| 30678   | 7590 09/24/2003   |                      |                         |                  |
| CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP<br>SUITE 800<br>1990 M STREET NW |                   |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
|   |                   |                      | GRAHAM, GARY K          |                  |
| WASHINGTO   | ON, DC 20036-3425 |                      | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER   |                  |
|   |                   |                      | 1744                    | /2               |
|   |                   |                      | DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/524,612   | GRAHAM, SCOTT  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Li Maries, Mederi  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gary K Graham  | 1744   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add  | ress                                     |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 September 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi                     | cation. A proper rep<br>ch places the applic               | oly to a<br>cation in                    |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).   | risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the  | f the final rejection.                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datase been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most partner adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the<br>d statutory period for reply originally set in | fee. The appropriate extending the final Office action; or | tension fee under<br>(2) as set forth in |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'</li> <li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. $igtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b   | ecause:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or   | in better form for appeal by mat   | erially reducing or s                                      | simplifying the                          |  |  |  |  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without cance  | ling a corresponding number of   | finally rejected clair                                     | ms.                                      |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: see attachment.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection  | ction(s): 112 second paragraph.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | I be allowable if submitted in a s   | eparate, timely file                                       | d amendment                              |  |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:   |  | sidered but does NO  | OT place the                             |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | cause it is not directed SOLELY  | to issues which we   | re newly                                 |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w  |  |  | and an                                   |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  | •  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,16 and 17</u> .  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10-15.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is   | a)□ approved or b)□ disap  | proved by the Exam   | niner.                                   |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme  | ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).   | /. /   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |  | Gary K Graham<br>Primary Examiner                          |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Art Unit: 1744   |  |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) Application/Control Number: 09/524,612

Art Unit: 1744

Applicant's amendments to the claims would require further consideration. While applicant's proposed amendments now make clear the combination in claims 1-8, such would require further consideration. As set forth in the 19 June 2003 office action, claim 1 and thus claims 2-8 were treated as the subcombination. The proposed amendment now has claims 2-8 directed to ---The apparatus of claim 1--- instead of "The mitt of claim 1". Clearly, such changes the scope of claims 2-8. Likewise, proposed claim 9 now calls for the combined brush and mitt. Presently claim 9 only calls for the mitt of claim 1. Claim 9 would require further consideration. It also should be noted that claim 9 appears to be a substantial duplicate of claim 1.

Gary K. Graham Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744

GKG 23 September 2003